



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,336	04/20/2001	Francis M. Anton, Jr.	VB.HEREUR.PT2	1893
24943	7590	10/07/2008		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP LLP				
12 SOUTH FIRST STREET				
SUITE 1205				
SAN JOSE, CA 95113				
EXAMINER				
DAO, THUY CHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

09/839,336

## Applicant(s)

ANTON, JR., FRANCIS M.

## Examiner

Thuy Dao

## Art Unit

2192

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on July 15, 2008.
2. Claims 1-10 and 12-24 have been examined.

### Response to Amendments

3. In the instant amendment, claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, and 19 have been amended; claim 11 has been canceled.

### Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments have been considered. However, they are not persuasive.
  - a) Rejections under 102(e), Foltak (Remarks, pp. 8-11):

#### Claim 9:

The limitations at issue, "(b) ...comparing a version of said second device management software against a version of said first device management software; and (c) for the version of said second device management software that is a different version from said first software device management, automatically loading the second device management software in said memory" (lines 4-8).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions. Foltak explicitly teaches:

(b) ...*comparing a version of said second device management software against a version of said first device management software* (e.g.,

col.2: 1-7, "The need to reload a processor may also occur when the current software is out-dated and an updated version of the software needs to be downloaded. In this case, downloading is for the purpose of upgrading the software" (emphasis added);

col.5: 52 – col.6: 5, "During upgrade, the DSP software is being replaced by a different code, such as a new and improved version", emphasis added); and

*(c) for the version of said second device management software that is a different version from said first software device management (e.g., col.7: 10-19; col.8: 31 – col.8: 60; col.10: 17-48; col.12: 58-65),  
automatically loading the second device management software in said memory (e.g., FIG. 4a-b, col.10: 33 – col.12: 57).*

**Claims 10-16:**

Claims 10-16 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 9 and thereby include all the limitations of amended claim 9, along with additional limitations. These claims are also rejected by virtue of their dependencies on the rejected base claim 9.

b) Rejections under 103(a), Foltak in view of Xu (Remarks, pp. 11-13):

**Claim 1:**

Claim 1 recites the newly added limitations in claim 9 and is also rejected as set forth in (a) above.

**Claims 2-8:**

Claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 1 and thereby include all the limitations of amended claim 1, along with additional limitations. These claims are also rejected by virtue of their dependencies on the rejected base claim 1.

c) Rejections under 103(a), Foltak in view of Xu and Hoff (Remarks, pp. 13-14):

**Claim 17:**

Claim 17 recites the newly added limitations in claim 9 and is also rejected as set forth in (a) above.

**Claims 18-24:**

Claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 17 and thereby include all the limitations of amended claim 17, along with additional limitations. These claims are also rejected by virtue of their dependencies on the rejected base claim 17.

In conclusion, the examiner respectfully maintains ground of the 35 USC §102 and §103 rejections over claims 1-10 and 11-24.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,606,298 to Foltak (art of record, hereinafter "Foltak").

#### **Claim 9:**

Foltak discloses *a method of maintaining software on a communication network access device, said method comprising:*

*first storing a first device management software in a memory in said device (e.g., FIG. 2, col.7: 27 – col.8: 60);*

*periodically checking availability of a second device management software (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.12: 58 – col.13: 67)*

*by comparing a version of said second device management software against a version of said first device management software (e.g., col.2: 1-7; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.7: 10-19); and*

for the version of said second device management software that is a different version from said first software device management (e.g., col.7: 10-19; col.8: 31 – col.8: 60; col.10: 17-48; col.12: 58-65),

*automatically loading the second device management software in said memory through said network for replacing said first software* (e.g., FIG. 4a-b, col.10: 33 – col.12: 57),

*immediately following said checking* (e.g., col.12: 59-65; col.10: 4-9; col.14: 48-56)

*such that the device is self-maintaining* (e.g., col.4: 16-44; col.8: 42-60).

**Claim 10:**

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *inputting upgrade data to a server from a computer, said data for installing and storing said second device management software in said server* (e.g., FIG. 3, col.8: 61 – col.10: 32).

**Claim 12:**

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *first authenticating an identity of said server to said device* (e.g., col.7: 27 – col.8: 60).

**Claim 13:**

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *second authenticating an identity of said device to said server* (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.8: 42-60).

**Claim 14:**

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *automatically performing said checking and said loading at a predetermined time without manual maintenance from a user* (e.g., col.10: 33 – col.12: 57).

**Claim 15:**

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *stopping an acceptance of a new connection prior to said loading* (e.g., col.8: 61 – col.10: 32).

**Claim 16:**

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *automatically performing said loading at a predetermined time without manual maintenance from a user* (e.g., col.4: 16-44; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5).

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foltak in view of Xu (art of record, US Patent No. 6,151,628).

**Claim 1:**

Foltak discloses *a system for software maintenance of a network access device, said system comprising:*

*an access point device for making a wireless connection between a mobile computer and a communications network* (e.g., FIG. 2, col.7: 27 – col.8: 60), *said device including*

*a memory of software containing first device management software for providing a device management function* (e.g., FIG. 3, col.8: 61 – col.10: 32; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5); *and*

*software loading apparatus for automatically loading second software through said network for replacing said first software (e.g., col.12: 58 – col.13: 67; FIG. 4a-b, col.10: 33 – col.12: 57)*

*directly begins loading upon checking that said first software requires replacement (e.g., col.12: 59-65; col.10: 4-9; col.14: 48-56)*

*due to a comparison determining the first software contains code that is different from the second software (e.g., col.2: 1-7; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.8: 31 – col.8: 60)*

*without manual maintenance by a user such that the access point device is self-maintaining (e.g., col.4: 16-44; col.8: 42-60).*

*Foltak does not explicitly disclose a wireless connection between a mobile computer and a communications network.*

*However, in an analogous art, Xu further discloses a wireless connection between a mobile computer and a communications network (e.g., FIG. 2, col.6: 38 – col.7: 56).*

*It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Xu's teaching into Foltak's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to serve not only users dialing in over the public switched telephone network but also wireless users as suggested by Xu (e.g., col.6: 37-54).*

**Claim 2:**

*The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses a server including apparatus for receiving data input from a computer for installation and storing said second software for said loading by said software loading apparatus through said network (e.g., FIG. 5, col.15: 1-62).*

**Claim 3:**

*The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses version checker apparatus for checking a version of said second software against a version of said first software (e.g., col.7: 27 – col.8: 60).*



**Claim 4:**

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *first authentication apparatus for authenticating an identity of said server to said device* (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5).

**Claim 5:**

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *second authentication apparatus for authenticating an identity of said device to said server* (e.g., col.12: 58 – col.13: 67; col.8: 42-60).

**Claim 6:**

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *automatic apparatus for automatically performing said checking and said loading at a predetermined time* (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.8: 61 – col.10: 32).

**Claim 7:**

The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *shut-down apparatus for stopping an acceptance of new connections prior to said loading* (e.g., col.7: 27 – col.8: 60; col.12: 58 – col.13: 67).

**Claim 8:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *said loading is performed automatically at a predetermined time* (e.g., col.15: 1-62).

9. Claims 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foltak in view of Xu (art of record, US Patent No. 6,151) and further in view of US Patent No. 5,978,373 to Hoff et al. (art made of record, hereinafter “Hoff”).

**Claim 17:**

Foltak discloses a system providing access to a communication network comprising:

(a) an access point device for making a connection between a mobile user and a source network (e.g., FIG. 2, col.7: 27 – col.8: 60), said access point device including

first device management software for providing a device management function (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.12: 58 – col.13: 67);

access device loading apparatus for loading second device management software through a network for replacing said first software (e.g., FIG. 4a-b, col.10: 33 – col.12: 57)

due to a comparison determining the first software contains code that is different from the second software (e.g., col.2: 1-7; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.7: 10-19; col.8: 31 – col.8: 60; col.10: 17-48; col.12: 58-65),

without manual maintenance by a user such that the access point device is self-maintaining (e.g., col.4: 16-44; col.8: 42-60);

(b) a mobile user to access the communication network through said access point device and said source network (e.g., FIG. 3, col.8: 61 – col.10: 32); and

(c) remote maintenance server apparatus including apparatus for receiving and storing an upgrade to said first software from a network connected computer for creation of said second software, and for facilitating said loading in cooperation with said access point device (e.g., col.15: 1-62; col.12: 58 – col.13: 67).

Foltak does not explicitly disclose a wireless connection between a mobile user and a source network, user authorization server apparatus for authorizing a mobile user to access the communication network through said access point device and said source network.

However, in an analogous art, Xu further discloses:

a wireless connection between a mobile user and a source network (e.g., FIG. 2, col.6: 38 – col.7: 56),

*user authorization server apparatus for authorizing a mobile user to access the communication network through said access point device and said source network (e.g., FIG. 1, Authentication Servers 32A-B, col.9: 47 – col.10: 53).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Xu's teaching into Foltak's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to serve not only users dialing in over the public switched telephone network but also wireless user as well as determine whether the user is authorized to access the system as suggested by Xu (e.g., col.6: 37-54; col.9: 48-65; col.10: 15-53).

Neither Foltak nor Xu explicitly discloses *the mobile user is authorized through one or more embedded IDs generated into an embedded reserved field of a file.*

However, in an analogous art, Hoff further discloses *the mobile user is authorized through one or more embedded IDs generated into an embedded reserved field of a file* (e.g., FIG. 4b, Completed Template Info Sent → If Info Same As Registration, Associate PC MAC With OLS → ... → FIG. 5, last step: Establish Session With Default OLS, col.7: 16-58 and col.8: 24-34, emphasis added).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hoff's teaching into Foltak and Xu's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide network access authentication suitable for network users as suggested by Xu (e.g., col.2: 1-15 and 62-65) as well as provide secure transmission of data as suggested by Hoff (e.g., col.2: 52 – col.3: 17).

**Claim 18:**

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated. Xu further discloses *said authorization server apparatus includes*

*source network server apparatus including apparatus for receiving a request from said mobile user to access said communication network, and for determining if said mobile user is currently authorized to access the communication network, and for a currently authorized mobile user to allow said authorized mobile user*

*said access, and for an unauthorized mobile user, not to forward said request (e.g., col.6: 38 – col.7: 56);*

*redirection server apparatus for receiving from said source server said forwarded request by said unauthorized mobile user for communication network access, and for redirecting said request (e.g., col.9: 47 – col.10: 53); and*

*user authentication server apparatus for receiving said unauthorized user's request from said redirection server, and for authorizing said unauthorized mobile user to access said communication network (e.g., col.6: 38 – col.7: 56); and*

*gate keeper server apparatus for receiving an authorization from said authentication server and for informing said source network apparatus that said mobile user is to be allowed access to said communication network (e.g., col.9: 47 – col.10: 53).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Xu's teaching into Foltak's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth in claim 17 above.

**Claim 19:**

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *said access point device further includes version checker apparatus for checking a version of said second software against a version of said first software (e.g., col.7: 27 – col.8: 60).*

**Claim 20:**

The rejection of claim 19 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *first authentication apparatus for authenticating an identity of said remote maintenance server to said access point device (e.g., col.5: 52 – col.6: 5; col.8: 61 – col.10: 32).*

**Claim 21:**

The rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *second authentication apparatus for authenticating an identity of said access point device to said remote maintenance server (e.g., col.12: 58 – col.13: 67; col.7: 27 – col.8: 60).*

**Claim 22:**

The rejection of claim 19 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *apparatus for automatically performing said checking and said loading at a predetermined time* (e.g., col.4: 16-44; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5).

**Claim 23:**

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *shut-down apparatus for stopping an acceptance of new connections prior to said loading* (e.g., col.8: 42-60; col.15: 1-62).

**Claim 24:**

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated. Foltak also discloses *said loading is performed automatically at a predetermined time* (e.g., col.10: 33 – col.12: 57; col.5: 52 – col.6: 5).

**Conclusion**

10. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192